

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hezel (EP 1 129 828) or Larsson (USP 4,904,148) in view of Akeel (USP 5,293,107).

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite that “each of the joint arms is disposed coaxially.” This amendment is supported in Figs. 1 and 2, and paragraphs [0030] - [0035] in the specification. No new matter has been added. Hezel does not recognize the need for, and fails to teach, a robot having each of the joint arms disposed coaxially. Larsson, as shown in FIGS. 2 and 4, also fails to teach a robot having each of the joint arms disposed coaxially. Akeel, which the Examiner cited for allegedly teaching a motor and gear arrangements, fails to cure the deficiency of Hezel and Larsson. Thus, there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness over the combination of Hezel or Larsson and Akeel. Independent claim 1 should be patentable over Hezel or Larsson in view of Akeel.

Claim 2 is dependent from claim 1; and claim 2 is patentable for at least the same reasons as set forth above in connection with independent claim 1.

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 1-2 in condition for allowance. The proposed amendments of claims 1-2 do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully point out that the final action by the Examiner presented some new arguments as to the application of the art against Applicants' invention. Entering of the Amendment would allow the Applicants to reply to the final rejections and place the application in condition for allowance.

Finally, the entry of the amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.


In view of the foregoing remarks, the claims, as amended are not rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 21, 2008

By:   
Jin Zhang  
Reg. No. 62,549  
Direct: (650) 849-6677

**Filed Via - EFS WEB**